UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,420	03/31/2004	Erik D.N. Monsen	F-803	5680

919   7590   01/21/2010
PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-3000

EXAMINER
SALIARD, SHANNON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/21/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iptl@pb.com

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10814420	3/31/2004	MONSEN ET AL.	F-803

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-3000

EXAMINER
SHANNON S. SALIARD

ART UNIT	PAPER
3628	20100114

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This Advisory Action is in response to the Amendment After Final filed on 09 December 2008.

For the puposes of appeal: The claim amendmnets will not be entered. The status of the claims is as follws: claims 1-3 and 5-24 are rejected.

The Request for Consideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues, "The art cited by the examiner do not disclose or anticipate a and i of claim namely (a) placing an identification code on individual mail pieces with a postage meter at a location other than the post office, wherein the identification code identifies a sender of the mail piece a service requested for the mail piece and uniquely identifies individual mail pieces; (i) printing at the postage meter a certificate indicating the identification code that has been read by the post office and the service requested for the mail piece" However, Examiner disagrees. Lee et al discloses placing an identification code on individual mail pieces with a postage meter at a location other than the post office, wherein the identification code identifies the sender of the mail piece and uniquely identifies individual mail pieces [col 3,lines 19-25; col 5, lines 32-45]. Lee et al further discloses that a mailer ID is placed on the manifest [col 4, lines 30-49]. While Lee et l discloses placing an identification code on individual mail pieces with a postage meter [col 3, lines 19-25; col 5, lines 32-45], Lee et al does not disclose wherein the identification code identifies a service requested for the mail piece. However, Ryan, Jr. discloses placing an identification code on a mail piece with a postage meter wherein the identification code identifies a service requested for the mail piece [0029; variable indicium on mail piece includes an indication of service class]. While Lee et al, Ryan, Jr. and Gawler discloses placing an identification code on a mail piece with a postage meter wherein the identification code identifies a service requested for the mail piece [Ryan, Jr: 0029; variable indicium on mail piece includes an indication of service class], Lee et al, Ryan, Jr. and Gawler do not further disclose further including the step of: printing at the postage meter a certificate indicating the identification code that has been read by the post office and the service requested for the mail piece. However, Pinstov discloses sending data, indicating that an identification code has been read by the post office [col 5, lines 14-25; 40-50]. It is known that data sent to a computer may be printed. Applicant argues, "The art cited by the Examiner do not disclose or anticipate printing at the postage meter a certificate indicating that the identification code and the service request has not been read by the post office after a certain period of time has elapsed after the data center has received the identification code from the meter." First the Examiner notes that the Applicant is arguing the references individually. Specifically, the Examiner articulated in the rejection of claim 1, the reasoning that printing a certificate of induction was obvious. Furthermore, Montgomery discloses, "At steps 1222 and 1224, the centralized postage-issuing computer system 386 receives the confirmatory delivery status information from the master tracking computer system 310 and updates the delivery status within the stored postage transaction information with the confirmatory delivery status information. In particular, the communications interface 1222, under control of the communications module 1234, receives the confirmatory delivery status information over the communications link 396 (step 1222). The database management module 1136 then updates the delivery status within the postage database 1130 (step 1224).

If the confirmatory delivery status information indicates that the mail piece carrying the tracking ID has been delivered, the delivery status associated with that tracking ID will be updated as delivered. If the confirmatory delivery status information indicates that the mail piece carrying the tracking ID has not been delivered, the delivery status associated with that tracking ID will be updated as not delivered." [0186]. Thus, combining teachings from the rejection of claim 1 with Montgomery, yield the Applicant's invention of "printing at the postage meter a certificate indicating that the identification code and the service request has not been read by the post office after a certain period of time has elapsed after the data center has received the identification code from the meter".

/Shannon S Saliard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628